DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 073 223 UD 013 381

AUTHOR	Horowitz, Joseph L.; And Others
TITLE	Repeated Measures Effects in Racial Attitudes Measurement.
INSTITUTION	Maryland Univ., College Park. Cultural Study Center.
REPORT NO	RR-8-72
PUB DATE	72
NOTE	16p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Attitude Tests; Caucasians; *Caucasian Students; *College Freshmen; Race Relations; *Racial Attitudes; Research Methodology; Semantic Differential; *Situational Tests; Test Construction; *Testing Problems; Test Interpretation; Test Validity; Test Wiseness
IDENTIFIERS	Maryland

ABSTRACT

The measurement of racial attitudes in contemporary America is presented with some serious methodological obstacles. In an attempt to eliminate these obstacles, Sedlacek and Brooks developed the Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) to measure the attitudes of whites toward blacks. It includes two Forms, A and B. The effects of the same individual taking one form after the other were not known. The SAS was administered to 164 white freshmen during summer orientation. Eighty received Form A followed by Form B (order 1) and 84 received Form B followed by Form A (Order 2). Results of a repeated measures analysis of variance design indicated that Form, Order, and their interaction were all significant above chance. The Form main effect showed that despite taking both forms, subjects still responded more negatively to Form B. The nature of the Order main effect and interaction indicates that subjects tended to be more negative toward blacks if they took form A first rather than Form B first. The writers interpreted this as indicating that it is harder to fake or withdraw from Form B than it is from Form A after a subject learns how his or her attitudes are being assessed. The writers conclude that it is possible to give an individual both forms of the S.A.S. and successfully measure his attitudes by examining differences between responses to the two forms. (Author/JM)

ED 073223

CULTURAL STUDY CENTER
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND

1972

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

REPEATED MEASURES EFFECTS IN RACIAL ATTITUDE MEASUREMENT

Joseph L. Horowitz, William E. Sedlacek
and Glenwood C. Brooks, Jr.

Research Report # 8-72

UD 013381

CULTURAL STUDY CENTER

REPEATED MEASURES EFFECTS IN RACIAL ATTITUDE MEASUREMENT

Joseph L. Horowitz, William E. Sedlacek and Glenwood C. Brooks, Jr.

Research Report # 8-72

SUMMARY

Previous research on the Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) has focused on its use as a group measure. That is, one group received Form A which made no reference to race and another group received Form B which made reference to blacks. If subjects were randomly assigned to groups, any differences in response must be attributed to the word black and inferences about the racial attitudes of both groups made. The effects of the same individual taking one form after the other were not known. The SAS was administered to 164 white freshmen during summer orientation. Eighty received Form A followed by Form B (Order 1) and 84 received Form B followed by Form A (Order 2). Results of a repeated measures analysis of variance design indicated that Form, Order and their interaction were all significant above chance (.05 level). The Form main effect showed that despite taking both forms, subjects still responded more negatively to Form B. The nature of the Order main effect and interaction indicates that subjects tended to be more negative toward blacks if they took Form A first rather than Form B first. The writers interpreted this as indicating that it is harder to fake or withdraw from Form B than it is from Form A after a subject learns how his or her attitudes are being assessed. The writers conclude that it is possible to give an individual both forms of the SAS and successfully measure his or her attitudes by examining differences between responses to the two forms. Generally it is recommended that Form A be administered first.

The results are discussed in terms of the variety of conditions under which the SAS can be given and still achieve a successful measurement of racial attitudes.

The measurement of racial attitudes in contemporary America is presented with some serious methodological obstacles. For example, it appears that among college students there is strong social reinforcement for being tolerant of or positive toward blacks. Today it is less socially acceptable to either verbalize or admit to oneself racial prejudices than in the quite recent past (Sedlacek and Brooks, 1971a, 1972a). An additional problem is the face validity of an instrument purporting to measure racial attitudes. Recent, rapid societal changes require an attitudinal measure to be contemporary if it is to be useful (e.g., using "black" rather than "Negro"). Obviously, the use of noncontemporary referents would make a racial attitude measure of questionable validity. A third obstacle might be termed psychological withdrawal. Sedlacek and Brooks (1970a) found that when white college students were given the opportunity to respond to either the race or the beliefs of a person, they chose the beliefs. The authors concluded that the racial context is crucial in racial attitude measurement. Unless white attitudes toward blacks are measured in context, the attitudes will be masked by whites, perhaps due to the social reinforcement for racial tolerance. Sedlacek and Brooks (1972a, p.1) state, "It appears, then, that an appropriate measure of racial attitudes would be subtle and provide a racial context to make difficult the psychological withdrawal from the measure."

In an attempt to eliminate or reduce the methodological obstacles cited above, Sedlacek and Brooks (1970b) developed the Situational Attitude Scale (SAS). The SAS was developed to measure the attitudes of whites toward blacks. To provide a racial context and make psychological withdrawal difficult, ten personal and social situations with some relevance to a racial response were created (see Table 1). The situations represented instances where race was a potential variable in how one might respond to the situation. For each of the 10 situations, 10 bipolar semantic differential scales were written (Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum,

1957), resulting in a total of 100 items for the SAS. Two forms of the SAS were developed, a neutral form (Form A) and a racial form (Form B). Both forms contain the same instructions, bipolar scales and situations, except that the word "black" was inserted into each situation of Form B, while Form A made no reference to race (see Table 1). The positive pole of the 100 bipolar items was varied randomly from right to left to avoid response set.

Since its first development, the SAS has stimulated a number of research studies. In the first experimental study using the SAS (Sedlacek and Brooks, 1970b), there was strong evidence that insertion of the word "black" (Form B) caused subjects (*S*s) (white college students) to respond differently than if no mention of race was made (Form A). They concluded that whites responded more negatively to Form B on all situations except III and VI. These two situations involve blacks occupying occupational roles (magazine salesman and policeman) and, interestingly, whites responded more positively to Form B in these situations. Sedlacek and Brooks concluded that whites generally respond more negatively to blacks than to whites in personal or social situations, except where blacks occupy stereotyped service roles.

Since that first study, all known SAS studies have supported those conclusions. Additionally, it has been found that: using the word "Negro" rather than "black" and "white" rather than no mention of race did not affect results (Brooks and Sedlacek, 1971); the race of the experimenter did not affect results (Sedlacek and Brooks, 1972b); whites respond in the same way to a person holding a belief regardless of the race of the believer (Sedlacek and Brooks, 1970a); whites holding negative attitudes toward blacks also tended to be more dogmatic and authoritarian than were whites with more positive racial attitudes (Sedlacek and Brooks, 1972c); white university freshmen have generally negative attitudes toward blacks, similar to those of upperclassmen or graduate students (Sedlacek and

Brooks, 1971b; Ball, 1971; Eberly, 1972); the methodology of the SAS reveals the negative attitudes of whites toward minorities in other nations (Denmark) (Brooks, Sedlacek and Chaples, 1971; Chaples, Sedlacek and Brooks, 1972); female and male college students respond differentially to the SAS situations, indicating that sex of respondent is a key variable to consider when asking "what are the attitudes of whites toward blacks?" (Sedlacek and Brooks, 1972d). All of this research seems to indicate that the SAS is a valid, reliable, valuable instrument to assess racial attitudes. However, to date, the SAS has one striking methodological limitation.

Because of the necessity of subtlety in racial attitude measurement, *S*s have typically been given no information about the existence of two forms (A and B), to try and insure that psychological withdrawal does not occur. Consequently, each *S* has been given only one form, and comparisons are based upon group measures rather than individual measures. In other words, a group of people are randomly given either Form A or B, and those who had Form A are compared with those who had Form B. Although this method provides a kind of instant norming on the group itself, it answers the question "what are the racial attitudes of this group of whites?" without providing information on the racial attitudes of a particular person. Thus, the SAS is designed to provide a group, rather than individual, measure of racial attitudes. The SAS Manual (Sedlacek and Brooks, 1972a, p.3) asserts that "Of course the SAS could be given several times to the same individual to assess change over time but the problems involved in retaking the SAS are not known at this time."

The purpose of this study was to investigate repeated measures effects in racial attitude measurement.

Method

The SAS was administered to 164 white students attending the Freshman Orientation Program of the University of Maryland, College Park. Each student was administered both Form A and Form B, but questionnaires were distributed randomly so that each student had an approximately equal chance of receiving either Form A followed by Form B (Order 1), or Form B followed by Form A (Order 2). The usable *N*s for each order, after deletion of incomplete questionnaires (N=6) and those completed by blacks (N=10) were: Order 1=80, Order 2=84. Data were analyzed by analysis of variance with Form (A or B) and Order (1 or 2) as main effects using a repeated measures design.

Results

Table 2 shows the means and standard deviations for each subgroup and significant F tests. Results indicated that 50 of the 100 items were significantly different on Form, 38 were significant on Order, and 28 were significant on the interaction of Form and Order. Sakoda, Cohen and Beall (1954) indicate one would expect only about nine tests to be significant due to chance at the .05 level out of 100 conducted, so the results appear well above chance. On Form, *S*s tended to be more negative on Form B in eight of the ten situations, particularly situations I (family next door) and V (friend becomes engaged). This indicates that whites held generally negative attitudes toward blacks in these situations. On situations III (man selling magazines) and VI (stopped by policeman), whites responded more positively to blacks in the situation than if there were no mention of race (Form A).

On Order, *S*s tended to be more negative on Order 1 (Form A followed by Form B) in nine of the ten situations, particularly situations III (man selling magazines) and VI (stopped by policeman). There were no main effect Order differences on situation II (man raped woman).

Of the 28 significant interactions, eight occurred in situation III (man selling magazines), six in situation VII (person joins social group), and five in situation IV (corner of loitering men). Eighteen of the interactions were of the reversal type and thirteen of these eighteen had Form A responses more negative on Order 2 (B, then A) and more positive on Order 1, and Form B responses more negative on Order 1 and more positive on Order 2.

Discussion

The findings that whites generally respond more negatively to blacks, especially so in the social situations of a new black family next door and a friend becoming engaged to a black are consistent with previous findings (e.g., Sedlacek and Brooks, 1970b, 1972a,b,c; Brooks and Sedlacek, 1971; Ball, 1971; Eberly, 1972). Also consistent with these past studies is the finding that whites respond more positively to blacks as magazine salesmen or policemen than if race is not mentioned. Thus, when whites are given both Form A and Form B of the SAS their responses are quite consistent with the responses of whites given only one form. The significance of this finding lies in the fact that once a respondent is given the second form (whether the second form is A or B), he is immediately cued that racial attitudes are being measured. This of course eliminates the "subtlety" that Sedlacek and Brooks (1970b) felt to be so important in their development of the SAS. This study shows that even when the measurement of racial attitudes is not subtle, the SAS reveals negative attitudes of whites toward blacks.

Looking in more detail at the Order effect, it can be seen that 35 of the 38 items significant on Order had significantly more negative responses to Order 1 than to Order 2. Thus, in virtually all items where Order was significant, presentation of Form A and then Form B generates more negative feeling than does

the presentation of Form B and then Form A. It is interesting to note that on situations III and VI , the Order effect was most pronounced -- precisely the same situations where whites felt positive toward blacks, as assessed by the Form effect.

Since presentation of the neutral form (A) followed by the black form (B) results in more negative feeling than does presentation of Form B followed by Form A, it could be that as *S*s begin to respond to the second form of the SAS and are aware that racial attitudes are being measured, they attempt to respond as "tolerantly" as possible to that second form. However, in so doing it is easier for whites to respond more positively to Form A than Form B since it has been shown previously that it is difficult to fake or psychologically withdraw from Form B. That is, despite their efforts to respond in a positive manner, whites cannot hide their negative attitudes toward blacks.

The interaction of Form and Order is more difficult to interpret. Of the 18 reversal-type interactions, Form A was more negative 13 times on Order 2 and five times on Order 1. Of the 10 nonreversal interactions, Form A was more negative eight times on Order 2 and two times on Order 1. Thus, Form A was more negative on Order 2 on 21 of the 28 significant interactions. This could be supportive of the hypothesis that *S*s attempt to appear "impartial" when they are aware that racial attitudes are being measured. Since Order 2 entails answering Form B first, followed by Form A, whites are faced with the dilemma of appearing impartial after expressing negative attitudes toward blacks. The only means available is to also express more negative attitudes where no mention is made of race (Form A). Order 1 entails making responses to Form B like those of Form A, that is positive attitudes. Thus, in an attempt to appear tolerant and impartial, whites respond relatively negatively to Form A, only when they have already responded negatively to Form B.

The reader is reminded of a number of methodological points. The polarity (positivity or negativity) of the items was based upon factor analyses and correlations reported in Sedlacek and Brooks (1972a). The SAS was discussed in terms of situations rather than items because of the relative independence of the situations as well as the relative unimportance of the exact wording of the bipolar items. Generally, a good-bad connotation seems to be the most salient feature of all items. Finally, in that this is the first study wherein each respondent was administered both forms of the SAS, conclusions must be regarded only as tentative.

Based upon the results of this study, it appears that both forms of the SAS may be administered to one individual and his or her racial attitudes will be measured. Thus, there is some reason to question the assertion of Sedlacek and Brooks (1970b, 1972a) that a racial attitude measure must be subtle to be effective. Further, it appears that the order of administration of the two forms is a relevant concern. Administering Form A and then B (Order 1) produces different results than the administration of Form B and then A (Order 2). Administration of Form A and then B results in more negative responses than does administration of Form B first. Possibly whites cannot mask their negative attitudes, even when they are aware that racial attitudes are being measured. The interaction of Form and Order indicates that Order 2 results in more negative attitudes on Form A than does Order 1, possibly another indication that whites attempt to mask their prejudice toward blacks. Thus, the general recommendation is to give Form A followed by B to the same person rather than Form B followed by A.

The results of this study must be regarded as tentative, until similar findings are obtained in both replications with white freshman samples as well

as with samples of upperclassmen or other *S*s. However, the results are encouraging in terms of their potential practical utility. Should these results prove stable, it would serve to broaden the utility of the SAS, and thus would enable us to assess the racial attitudes of both groups and individuals.

References

Ball, H. W. Racial attitudes of white educators in a situational context. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of Maryland, 1971.

Brooks, G. C., Jr., & Sedlacek, W. E. Choice of racial referent as a variable in racial attitude measurement. *Cultural Study Center Research Report # 5-71*, 1971, University of Maryland.

Brooks, G. C., Jr., Sedlacek, W. E., & Chaples, E. A. A cross-cultural comparison of Danish and U.S. racial attitudes. *Cultural Study Center Research Report # 10-71*, 1971, University of Maryland. Also in *American Psychological Association Proceedings*, 1972, 7, 283-284.

Chaples, E. A., Sedlacek, W. E., & Brooks, G. C., Jr. Measuring prejudicial attitudes in a situational context: A report on a Danish experiment. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 1972, (in press).

Eberly, C. G. Racial attitudes of Michigan State University freshmen. Presented at the American Personnel and Guidance Association Convention, Chicago, March 27, 1972.

Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J., & Tannenbaum, P. H. *The measurement of meaning*. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Sakoda, J. M., Cohen, B. H., & Beall, G. Tests of significance for a series of statistical tests. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1954, 51, 172-175.

Sedlacek, W. E., & Brooks, G. C., Jr. The measurement of attitudes of whites toward blacks with certain beliefs. *Cultural Study Center Research Report # 7-70*, 1970a, University of Maryland.

Sedlacek, W. E., & Brooks, G. C., Jr. Measuring racial attitudes in a situational context. *Psychological Reports*, 1970b, 27, 971-980.

Sedlacek, W. E., & Brooks, G. C., Jr. Social acceptability in the measurement of racial attitudes. *Psychological Reports*, 1971a, 29, 17-18.

Sedlacek, W. E., & Brooks, G. C., Jr. Racial attitudes of white university freshmen. *Cultural Study Center Research Report # 7-71*, 1971b, University of Maryland.

Sedlacek, W. E., & Brooks, G. C., Jr. *Situational attitude scale (SAS) manual*. Chicago: Natresources, Inc., 1972a.

Sedlacek, W. E., & Brooks, G. C., Jr. Race of experimenter in racial attitude measurement. *Psychological Reports*, 1972b, 30, 771-774.

Sedlacek, W. E., & Brooks, G. C., Jr. Racial attitudes, authoritarianism and dogmatism among university students. *College Student Journal*, 1972c, 6, 43-44.

Sedlacek, W. E., & Brooks, G. C., Jr. Differences in racial attitudes of white males and females. *Cultural Study Center Research Report # 2-72*, 1972d, University of Maryland.

TABLE 1

Instructions and Situations from the Situational Attitude Scale*

INSTRUCTIONS

This questionnaire measures how people think and feel about a number of social and personal incidents and situations. It is not a test so there are no right or wrong answers. The questionnaire is anonymous so please DO NOT SIGN YOUR NAME.

Each item or situation is followed by 10 descriptive word scales. Your task is to select, for each descriptive scale, the rating which best describes YOUR feelings toward the item.

Sample item: Going out on a date

happy ' A ' B ' C ' D ' E ' sad

You would indicate the direction and extent of your feelings (e.g., you might select B) by indicating your choice (B) on your response sheet by blackening in the appropriate space for that word scale. DO NOT MARK ON THE BOOKLET. PLEASE RESPOND TO ALL WORD SCALES.

Sometimes you may feel as though you had the same item before on the questionnaire. This will not be the case, so DO NOT LOOK BACK AND FORTH through the items. Do not try to remember how you checked similar items earlier in the questionnaire. MAKE EACH ITEM A SEPARATE AND INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT. Respond as honestly as possible without puzzling over individual items. Respond with your first impressions whenever possible.

SITUATIONS

	FORM A	FORM B
I.	A new family moves in next door to you.	A new black family moves in next door to you.
II.	You read in the paper that a man has raped a woman.	You read in the paper that a black man has raped a white woman.
III.	It is evening and a man appears at your door saying he is selling magazines.	It is evening and a black man appears at your door saying he is selling magazines.
IV.	You are walking down the street alone and must pass a corner where a group of five young men are loitering.	You are walking down the street alone and must pass a corner where a group of five your black men are loitering.
V.	Your best friend has just become engaged.	Your best friend has just become engaged to a black person.
VI.	You are stopped for speeding by a policeman.	You are stopped for speeding by a black policeman.
VII.	A new person joins your social group.	A new black person joins your social group.
VIII.	You see a youngster steal something in a dimestore.	You see a black youngster steal something in a dimestore.
IX.	Some students on campus stage a demonstration.	Some black students on campus stage a demonstration.
X.	You get on a bus and you are the only person who has to stand.	You get on a bus that has all black people aboard and you are the only person who has to stand.

*The Situational Attitude Scale is copyrighted and available from Natresources, Inc., 520 N. Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60611.

TABLE 2

Means, Standard Deviations, and Results of Analyses of Variance[a]

ITEM NO.	SITUATIONS[b] BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSION	ORDER 1 (A, then B) (*N*=80) FORM A MEAN	FORM A S.D.	FORM B MEAN	FORM B S.D.	ORDER 2 (B, then A) (*N*=84) FORM A MEAN	FORM A S.D.	FORM B MEAN	FORM B S.D.	SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES[c]
	I. NEW FAMILY NEXT DOOR									
1	good-bad	1.08	0.88	1.81	1.19	1.25	0.93	1.70	0.97	F
2	safe-unsafe	1.11	0.91	1.60	1.24	0.88	0.88	1.13	1.02	F,O
3	angry-not angry	3.30	1.02	2.61	1.26	3.08	1.03	2.98	1.20	F,FxO
4	friendly-unfriendly	0.79	0.76	1.18	1.14	0.57	0.73	0.93	0.99	F,O
5	sympathetic-not sympathetic	1.89	1.18	1.70	1.27	1.80	1.12	2.05	1.19	FxO
6	nervous-calm	2.81	1.13	2.28	1.21	2.86	1.20	2.74	1.22	F,FxO
7	happy-sad	1.35	0.86	1.85	1.02	1.26	0.96	1.79	0.91	F
8	objectionable-acceptable	3.03	1.04	2.54	1.33	3.19	1.07	3.00	1.14	F,O
9	desirable-undesirable	1.40	0.85	1.98	1.10	1.25	0.94	1.71	1.04	F
10	suspicious-trusting	2.70	0.93	2.28	1.19	2.94	0.96	2.83	1.05	F,O
	II. MAN RAPED WOMAN									
11	affection-disgust	3.43	0.84	3.44	0.91	3.54	0.68	3.37	0.89	
12	relish-repulsion	3.21	0.91	3.33	0.90	3.42	0.79	3.21	0.98	
13	happy-sad	3.34	0.87	3.41	0.91	3.45	0.75	3.45	0.77	
14	friendly-hostile	3.15	0.90	3.15	0.93	3.12	0.84	2.92	0.97	
15	uninvolved-involved	1.79	1.24	2.13	1.35	2.20	1.31	1.68	1.32	FxO
16	hope-hopelessness	2.20	1.04	2.30	1.32	2.19	1.33	2.08	1.12	
17	aloof-outraged	2.58	1.08	2.76	1.01	2.77	1.07	2.42	1.06	FxO
18	injure-kill	1.58	1.15	1.79	1.30	1.70	1.12	1.51	1.24	FxO
19	safe-fearful	2.35	1.21	2.60	1.20	2.42	1.22	2.49	1.13	F
20	empathetic-can't understand	2.51	1.19	2.50	1.25	2.49	1.28	2.33	1.23	
	III. MAN SELLING MAGAZINES									
21	relaxed-startled	2.25	1.17	2.68	1.10	2.06	1.32	1.76	1.28	O, FxO
22	receptive-cautious	2.89	1.13	2.96	1.00	2.30	1.22	2.21	1.23	O
23	excited-unexcited	3.01	0.97	2.23	1.16	2.33	1.14	2.57	1.09	F,FxO
24	glad-angered	2.30	0.72	2.39	0.67	2.24	0.72	2.01	0.65	O,FxO
25	pleased-annoyed	2.86	0.87	2.70	0.86	2.49	0.92	2.31	0.82	F,O
26	indifferent-suspicious	2.39	1.41	2.54	1.31	1.93	1.29	1.43	1.27	O,FxO
27	tolerable-intolerable	1.58	1.03	1.71	1.14	1.52	1.15	1.21	1.06	FxO
28	afraid-secure	1.96	1.17	1.66	1.12	2.05	1.14	2.26	1.13	O,FxO
29	friend-enemy	2.03	0.87	2.13	0.85	1.77	0.94	1.48	0.90	O,FxO
30	unprotected-protected	2.35	1.10	2.06	1.17	2.18	1.22	2.31	1.04	FxO

[a]Scale A to E (Numerical equivalent, 0 to 4)
[b]See Table 1 for complete situation.
[c]Results of 2-way analysis of variance (fixed effects) with F (Form, A or B), and O (Order, 1 or 2) as main effects and FxO as the interaction. Complete ANOVA tables are available from the Cultural Study Center, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742.

TABLE 2

Means, Standard Deviations, and Results of Analyses of Variance[a]

ITEM NO.	SITUATIONS[b] BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSION	ORDER 1 (A, then B) (*N*=80) FORM A MEAN	FORM A S.D.	FORM B MEAN	FORM B S.D.	ORDER 2 (B, then A) (*N*=84) FORM A MEAN	FORM A S.D.	FORM B MEAN	FORM B S.D.	SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES[c]
	IV. CORNER OF LOITERING MEN									
31	relaxed-tensed	3.25	0.92	3.40	0.92	2.62	1.23	3.08	1.06	F,O,FxO
32	pleased-angered	2.30	0.60	2.69	0.77	2.19	0.61	2.26	0.82	F,O,FxO
33	superior-inferior	2.20	1.07	1.88	1.06	1.95	0.81	2.04	0.82	FxO
34	smarter-dumber	1.41	0.85	1.53	0.95	1.74	0.71	1.67	0.91	
35	whiter-blacker	1.82	0.76	1.29	1.05	1.90	0.74	1.43	1.16	F
36	aggressive-passive	2.34	1.10	2.36	1.21	2.58	0.93	2.84	1.05	O
37	safe-unsafe	2.76	1.06	2.83	1.14	2.32	1.13	2.79	1.00	F,FxO
38	friendly-unfriendly	2.46	1.11	2.43	1.14	2.04	1.09	2.27	1.15	
39	excited-unexcited	2.01	1.15	1.76	1.16	2.00	1.06	1.85	1.15	F
40	trivial-important	1.91	1.05	1.74	1.24	1.87	1.28	2.11	1.26	FxO
	V. FRIEND BECOMES ENGAGED									
41	aggressive-passive	1.49	1.09	1.81	1.10	1.94	1.27	2.37	1.35	F,O
42	happy-sad	0.64	1.05	1.75	1.35	0.39	0.73	1.52	1.49	F
43	tolerable-intolerable	0.68	0.94	1.40	1.32	0.46	0.81	1.13	1.32	F,O
44	complimented-insulted	1.11	1.04	1.91	1.14	0.99	1.00	1.74	1.10	F
45	angered-overjoyed	3.14	0.94	2.14	1.19	3.13	0.85	2.45	1.06	F
46	secure-fearful	1.41	1.12	1.79	1.24	0.85	1.00	1.49	1.27	F,O
47	hopeful-hopeless	1.05	1.11	1.58	1.37	0.52	0.81	1.18	1.24	F,O
48	excited-unexcited	0.94	1.07	1.65	1.18	0.64	0.85	1.35	1.17	F,O
49	right-wrong	1.16	1.17	1.68	1.36	0.82	0.98	1.68	1.35	F
50	disgusting-pleasing	3.30	1.00	2.30	1.25	3.56	0.72	2.48	1.20	F,O
	VI. STOPPED BY POLICEMAN									
51	calm-nervous	3.10	1.25	2.84	1.43	2.67	1.47	2.52	1.52	F,O
52	trusting-suspicious	1.93	1.27	1.61	1.30	0.89	0.98	0.88	1.15	F,O
53	afraid-safe	1.55	1.36	2.08	1.40	2.27	1.43	2.62	1.51	F,O
54	friendly-unfriendly	1.40	1.13	1.39	1.13	0.92	1.06	1.07	1.22	O
55	tolerant-intolerant	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.15	0.71	0.91	0.88	1.11	O
56	bitter-pleasant	2.09	1.31	2.23	1.28	2.70	1.27	2.61	1.24	O
57	cooperative-uncooperative	0.60	0.95	0.68	1.00	0.46	0.86	0.57	1.00	
58	acceptive-belligerent	1.00	1.01	1.03	1.12	0.62	0.83	0.73	1.05	O
59	inferior-superior	1.78	1.01	1.88	0.93	1.80	0.60	1.82	0.78	
60	smarter-dumber	1.80	0.97	1.86	0.90	2.05	0.60	2.07	0.67	O

[a]Scale A to E (Numerical equivalent, 0 to 4)

[b]See Table 1 for complete situation.

[c]Results of 2-way analysis of variance (fixed effects) with F (Form, A or B), and O (Order, 1 or 2) as main effects and FxO as the interaction. Complete ANOVA tables are available from the Cultural Study Center, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742.

TABLE 2

Means, Standard Deviations, and Results of Analyses of Variance[a]

ITEM NO.	SITUATIONS[b] BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSION	ORDER 1 (A, then B) (N=80) FORM A MEAN	FORM A S.D.	FORM B MEAN	FORM B S.D.	ORDER 2 (B, then A) (N=84) FORM A MEAN	FORM A S.D.	FORM B MEAN	FORM B S.D.	SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES[c]
	VII. PERSON JOINS SOCIAL GROUP									
61	warm-cold	0.85	0.96	1.20	1.10	0.96	0.96	1.00	1.03	FxO
62	sad-happy	2.98	0.95	2.54	1.04	2.88	0.86	2.70	1.07	F
63	superior-inferior	1.51	0.76	1.80	0.79	1.95	0.51	1.94	0.59	O,FxO
64	threatened-neutral	3.00	1.16	2.90	1.25	3.25	0.94	3.21	1.10	
65	pleased-displeased	0.96	0.93	1.33	1.18	1.08	0.92	1.24	1.13	F,FxO
66	understanding-indifferent	0.89	0.99	1.34	1.17	1.30	1.30	1.20	1.30	FxO
67	suspicious-trusting	2.68	0.96	2.35	1.13	2.96	0.90	2.96	1.11	O,FxO
68	disappointed-elated	2.48	0.86	2.30	0.88	2.49	0.78	2.36	1.02	
69	favorable-unfavorable	1.08	1.06	1.33	1.10	1.05	0.99	1.05	1.08	FxO
70	uncomfortable-comfortable	2.68	1.14	2.55	1.20	3.08	0.92	2.99	1.08	O
	VIII. YOUNGSTER STEALS									
71	surprising-not surprising	2.43	1.59	2.86	1.34	1.96	1.33	2.47	1.22	F,O
72	sad-happy	0.81	0.87	0.93	1.05	0.85	1.01	0.92	1.01	
73	disinterested-interested	2.71	1.23	2.68	1.24	2.42	1.24	2.29	1.30	
74	close-distant	1.81	1.27	2.15	1.24	2.05	1.25	2.20	1.21	F
75	understandable-baffling	1.61	1.35	1.44	1.27	1.76	1.27	1.35	1.20	F
76	responsible-not responsible	2.39	1.45	2.33	1.42	2.19	1.34	2.53	1.20	FxO
77	concerned-unconcerned	1.34	1.31	1.48	1.29	1.27	1.32	1.24	1.23	
78	sympathy-indifference	1.66	1.30	1.75	1.37	1.64	1.30	1.74	1.41	
79	expected-unexpected	1.81	1.22	1.52	1.15	2.07	1.07	1.92	1.10	F,O
80	hopeful-hopeless	1.85	1.11	1.98	1.30	1.50	1.16	1.66	1.25	O
	IX. CAMPUS DEMONSTRATION									
81	bad-good	1.95	1.16	1.83	1.22	1.88	1.19	1.82	1.29	
82	understanding-indifferent	1.58	1.23	1.93	1.19	1.57	1.01	1.92	1.39	F
83	suspicious-trusting	1.55	0.97	1.58	1.06	1.82	1.14	1.71	1.18	
84	safe-unsafe	2.26	1.12	2.39	1.21	2.08	1.25	2.38	1.18	F
85	disturbed-undisturbed	1.73	1.19	1.53	1.17	1.52	1.07	1.56	1.26	
86	justified-unjustified	1.74	1.02	1.99	1.10	1.73	0.99	1.77	1.14	F
87	tense-calm	1.69	1.18	1.44	1.16	1.76	1.05	1.50	1.11	F
88	hate-love	2.08	0.82	1.86	0.85	2.07	0.72	1.95	0.94	F
89	wrong-right	2.08	1.06	2.00	1.11	2.08	1.04	1.90	1.16	
90	humorous-serious	2.90	1.07	3.09	0.96	2.95	0.94	3.14	0.96	F

[a]Scale A to E (Numerical equivalent, 0 to 4)
[b]See Table 1 for complete situation.
[c]Results of 2-way analysis of variance (fixed effects) with F (Form, A or B), and O (Order, 1 or 2) as main effects and FxO as the interaction. Complete ANOVA tables are available from the Cultural Study Center, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742.

TABLE 2

Means, Standard Deviations, and Results of Analyses of Variance[a]

ITEM NO.	SITUATIONS[b] BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSION	ORDER 1 (A, then B) (*N*=80) FORM A MEAN	FORM A S.D.	FORM B MEAN	FORM B S.D.	ORDER 2 (B, then A) (*N*=84) FORM A MEAN	FORM A S.D.	FORM B MEAN	FORM B S.D.	SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES[c]
	X. ONLY PERSON STANDING									
91	fearful-secure	2.33	1.12	1.48	1.17	2.72	1.03	1.82	1.22	F,O
92	tolerable-intolerable	1.33	1.25	1.54	1.22	0.93	1.05	1.30	1.18	F
93	hostile-indifferent	2.99	1.10	2.43	1.25	3.00	1.06	2.83	1.08	F,FxO
94	important-trivial	2.99	1.11	2.50	1.26	2.86	1.08	2.73	1.12	F,FxO
95	conspicuous-inconspicuous	1.19	1.31	0.68	1.12	1.47	1.31	1.04	1.22	F,O
96	calm-anxious	1.70	1.33	2.58	1.18	1.49	1.29	2.33	1.23	F
97	indignant-understanding	2.54	1.22	2.22	1.17	2.69	1.04	2.50	1.23	O
98	comfortable-uncomfortable	2.53	1.17	2.85	1.19	2.17	1.35	2.52	1.26	F
99	hate-love	1.99	0.54	1.88	0.66	2.22	0.64	2.06	0.75	F,O
100	not resentful-resentful	1.24	1.11	1.51	1.16	1.24	1.17	1.31	1.18	

[a]Scale A to E (Numerical equivalent, 0 to 4)
[b]See Table 1 for complete situation.
[c]Results of 2-way analysis of variance (fixed effects) with F (Form, A or B), and O (Order, 1 or 2) as main effects and FxO as the interaction. Complete ANOVA tables are available from the Cultural Study Center, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742.